## Interview Summary

Application No.

Applicant(s)

09/686,346

Cobb et al.

Examiner

Maryam Monshipouri

Art Unit 1652

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):  (1) Maryam Monshipouri  (2) Mr. M.B. Wilson  Date of Interview May 16, 2003  Type: al Telephonic bl video Conference cl Personal (copy is given to 110 applicant 210 applicant's representative)  Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: dl Yes el X No. If yes, brief description:  Claim(s) discussed: 28, 29, and 34  Identification of prior art discussed:  Agreement with respect to the claims fl X was reached. gl was not reached. hl N/A.  Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:  It was indicaged that although no prior art anticipated the elected invention (methods of use of TAO2 kinases only), the claims are subject to 112 list rejections as varients recited in claims 28 and 29 are too brood. Also it was mentioned that the invention is merely enabled when MEX or MEX could be used in step (c) of claims 28-29 because the inventor herself has published that TAO polypeptides do not bind MEX2. For 4. The examiner suggested to use the varaint languages used in the parent case (U.S. Pat No. 6, 165,461) claims and restrict the claims to TAO2 polypelides in order to put the claims possibly in condition for allowance.  In response, Mr. Wilson agreed with the examiner's proposal and after talking to the applicant gave the authority to the examiner to amend the claims accordingly, in an examiner's amendment.  IA fuller description. If necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).  In the not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).  In the not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).  In the not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).  In the not necessary for applicant to provide a separate rec		
(4)   Date of Interview   May 16, 2003   Type: a  X  Telephonic   b)   Video Conference   c    Personal [copy is given to 1)   applicant 2)   applicant's representative]   Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)   Yes   e) X   No. If yes, brief description:   Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)   Yes   e) X   No. If yes, brief description:   Claim[s] discussed:   28, 29, and 34   Identification of prior art discussed:	All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PT	O personnel):
(4)   Date of Interview   May 16, 2003   Type: a)   Telephonic   b)   Video Conference   c    Personal (copy is given to 1)   applicant 2)   applicant's representative]   Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)   Yes   e)   No. If yes, brief description:   Claim(s) discussed:   28, 29, and 34   Identification of prior art discussed:	(1) Maryam Monshipouri	(3)
Type: a  X Telephonic b  Video Conference c  Personal (copy is given to 1)   applicant 2   applicant's representative)    Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d  Yes e  X No. If yes, brief description:  Claim(s) discussed: 28, 29, and 34    Identification of prior art discussed:  Agreement with respect to the claims f  X was reached. g  was not reached. h  N/A.  Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:  It was indicates that although no prior art anticipated the elected invention (methods of use of TAO2 kinases only), the claims are subject to 112 first rejections as variants recited in claims 28 and 29 are too braod. Also it was mentioned that the invention is merely enabled when MEK3 or MEK6 could be used in step (c) of claims 28-29 because the inventor herself has published that TAO polypeptides do not bind MEK2, \$\overline{9}\$ or 4. The examiner suggested to set we variant language used in the parent case (U.S. Pal No. 6, 165,461/ claims and restrict the claims to TAO2 polypetides in order to put the claims possibly in condition for allowance.  In response, Mr. Wilson agreed with the examiner's proposal and after talking to the applicant gave the authority to the examiner to amend the claims accordingly, in an examiner's amendment.  (A fuller description, if necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).  Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN DONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW. To THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached  Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is	(2) Mr. M.B. Wilson	
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d  Yes e  No. If yes, brief description:    Claim(s) discussed: 28, 29, and 34     Identification of prior art discussed:	Date of Interview May 16, 2003	<del></del> .
Claim(s) discussed: 28, 29, and 34  Identification of prior art discussed:  Agreement with respect to the claims   f X    was reached.   g    was not reached.   h    N/A.  Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:  It was indicated that although no prior art anticipated the elected invention (methods of use of TAO2 kinases only), the claims are subject to 112 first rejections as variants recited in claims 28 and 29 are too broad. Also it was mentioned that the invention is merely enabled when MEK3 or MEK6 could be used in step (c) of claims 28-29 because the inventor herself has published that TAO polyaperides do not blind MEK2, 5 or 4. The examiner suggested to use the variant language used in the parent case (U.S. Pat No. 6, 165,461) claims and restrict the claims to TAO2 polyapetides in order to put the claims possibly in condition for allowance.  In response, Mr. Wilson agreed with the examiner's proposal and after talking to the applicant gave the authority to the examiner to amend the claims accordingly, in an examiner's amendment.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  i)		nt 2) applicant's representative]
Agreement with respect to the claims fi⊠ was reached. gl□ was not reached. hl□ N/A.  Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:  It was indicatesd that although no prior art anticipated the elected invention (methods of use of TAO2 kinases only), the claims are subject to 112 first rejections as variants recited in claims 28 and 29 are too braod. Also it was mentioned that the invention is merely enabled when MEK3 or MEK6 could be used in step (c.) of claims 28-29 because the inventor herself has published that TAO polypeptides do not bind MEK2, 5 or 4. The examiner suggested to use the varaint language used in the parent case (U.S. Pat No. 6, 165,461) claims and restrict the claims to TAO2 polypeitdes in order to put the claims possibly in condition for allowance.  In response, Mr. Wilson agreed with the examiner's proposal and after talking to the applicant gave the authority to the examiner to amend the claims accordingly, in an examiner's amendment.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, it available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable asummary thereof must be attached.)  It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).  Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached	Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)   Yes	e) 🛮 No. If yes, brief description:
Agreement with respect to the claims fix was reached. gl was not reached. h N/A.  Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:  It was indicatesd that although no prior art anticipated the elected invention [methods of use of TAO2 kinases only], the claims are subject to 112 first rejections as variants recited in claims 28 and 29 are too braod. Also it was mentioned that the invention is merely enabled when MEKS of MEKS could be used in step (c) of claims 28-29 because the inventor herself has published that TAO polypeptides do not bind MEK2, for 4. The examiner suggested to use the varaint language used in the parent case (U.S. Pat No. 6, 165,461) claims and restrict the claims to TAO2 polypetides in order to put the claims possibly in condition for allowance.  In response, Mr. Wilson agreed with the examiner's proposal and after talking to the applicant gave the authority to the examiner to amend the claims accordingly, in an examiner's amendment.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, it available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable as unmary thereof must be attached.)  i) X It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).  Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached	Claim(s) discussed: <u>28, 29, and 34</u>	
Agreement with respect to the claims f X  was reached. g \ was not reached. h \ N/A.  Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:  It was indicatesd that although no prior art anticipated the elected invention (methods of use of TAO2 kinases only), the claims are subject to 112 first rejections as variants recited in claims 28 and 29 are too broad. Also it was mentioned that the invention is merely enabled when MEK3 or MEK6 could be used in step (c.) of claims 28-29 because the inventor herself has published that TAO polypeptides do not bind MEK2, 5 or 4. The examiner suggested to use the variant language used in the parent case (U.S. Pat No. 6, 165,461) claims and restrict the claims to TAO2 polypeitides in order to put the claims possibly in condition for allowance.  In response, Mr. Wilson agreed with the examiner's proposal and after talking to the applicant gave the authority to the examiner to amend the claims accordingly, in an examiner's amendment.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  i)X  It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).  Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filled, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW requirements on reverse side or on attached  Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is	Identification of prior art discussed:	
any other comments:  It was indicatesd that although no prior art anticipated the elected invention (methods of use of TAO2 kinases only), the claims are subject to 112 first rejections as variants recited in claims 28 and 29 are too braod. Also it was mentioned that the invention is merely enabled when MEK3 or MEK6 could be used in step (c.) of claims 28-29 because the inventor herself has published that TAO polypeptides do not bind MEK2, or 4. The examiner suggested to use the variant language used in the parent case (U.S. Pat No. 6, 165,461) claims and restrict the claims to TAO2 polypeitdes in order to put the claims possibly in condition for allowance.  In response, Mr. Wilson agreed with the examiner's proposal and after talking to the applicant gave the authority to the examiner to amend the claims accordingly, in an examiner's amendment.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  i) [X] It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).  Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been flied, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached  Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is		
It was indicatesd that although no prior art anticipated the elected invention (methods of use of TAO2 kinases only), the claims are subject to 112 first rejections as variants recited in claims 28 and 29 are too braod. Also it was mentioned that the invention is merely enabled when MEK3 or MEK6 could be used in step (c) of claims 28-29 because the inventor herself has published that TAO polypeptides do not bind MEK2, \$\overline{T}\$ or 4. The examiner suggested to use the variant language used in the parent case (U.S. Pat No. 6, 165,461) claims and restrict the claims to TAO2 polypeitdes in order to put the claims possibly in condition for allowance.  In response, Mr. Wilson agreed with the examiner's proposal and after talking to the applicant gave the authority to the examiner to amend the claims accordingly, in an examiner's amendment.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  i) \(\mathbb{\text{K}}\) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked). Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached		eral nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or
claims are subject to 112 first rejections as variants recited in claims 28 and 29 are too braod. Also it was mentioned that the invention is merely enabled when MEK3 or MEK6 could be used in step (c.) of claims 28-29 because the inventor herself has published that TAO polypeptides do not bind MEK2, 5 or 4. The examiner suggested to use the variant language used in the parent case (U.S. Pat No. 6, 165,461) claims and restrict the claims to TAO2 polypeitides in order to put the claims possibly in condition for allowance.  In response, Mr. Wilson agreed with the examiner's proposal and after talking to the applicant gave the authority to the examiner to amend the claims accordingly, in an examiner's amendment.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked). Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached  Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is	·	he elected invention (methods of use of TAO2 kinases only), the
herself has published that TAO polypeptides do not bind MEK2, \$\frac{5}{0}\$ or 4. The examiner suggested to use the varaint language used in the parent case (U.S. Pat No. 6, 165,461) claims and restrict the claims to TAO2 polypeitdes in order to put the claims possibly in condition for allowance.  In response, Mr. Wilson agreed with the examiner's proposal and after talking to the applicant gave the authority to the examiner to amend the claims accordingly, in an examiner's amendment.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  ilX\text{\text{\text{I}} It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked). Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached  Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is		
language used in the parent case (U.S. Pat No. 6, 165,461) claims and restrict the claims to TAO2 polypeitdes in order to put the claims possibly in condition for allowance.  In response, Mr. Wilson agreed with the examiner's proposal and after talking to the applicant gave the authority to the examiner to amend the claims accordingly, in an examiner's amendment.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  ilX It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked). Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached  Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is		
In response, Mr. Wilson agreed with the examiner's proposal and after talking to the applicant gave the authority to the examiner to amend the claims accordingly, in an examiner's amendment.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked). Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached		
In response, Mr. Wilson agreed with the examiner's proposal and after talking to the applicant gave the authority to the examiner to amend the claims accordingly, in an examiner's amendment.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked). Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached  Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is		161) claims and restrict the claims to TAO2 polypeitdes in order
examiner to amend the claims accordingly, in an examiner's amendment.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked). Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached  Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is	to put the claims possibly in condition for allowance.	
allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable available, a summary thereof must be attached.)  i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked). Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached  Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is		
Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached  Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is	allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where n	endments which the examiner agreed would render the claims no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is
INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached  Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is	i) 🔀 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a se	parate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).
	INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See Malready been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH F	MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE
an Attachment to a signed Office action.	Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.	Examiner's signature, if required